DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 266 840 JC 860 134

AUTHOR Andrews, Hans A.
TITLE Awarding Faculty Merit Based on Higher Level Needs.
INSTITUTION Illinois Valley Community Coll., Oglesby.
PUB DATE [86]
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Promotion; *Merit Pay; *Merit Rating; National Surveys; Personnel Policy; Recognition (Achievement); Tenure

ABSTRACT

In 1984-85, a nationwide survey was conducted of merit pay practices in community colleges to discover the impact of public pressure for merit pay on the community college system. Questionnaires were sent to more than 1,300 community, technical, and junior colleges, requesting information on the nature of faculty evaluation at each college. Study findings, based on a 62.7% response rate (N=816), included the following: (1) 700 respondents indicated that both part-time and full-time instructors, including tenured faculty, were subjected to regular, systematic evaluation; (2) 18.1% of the respondents had an operational faculty merit system; (3) 151 institutions used a combination of classroom observation and student evaluation in faculty evaluation; 116 used a combination of classroom observation, peer review, and student evaluation; and 71 placed primary emphasis on student evaluation; (4) 41% indicated that there was a "presence of faculty collective bargaining" on campus; (5) 14 states had no community colleges with merit pay plans; and (6) the Virginia community college system and the State University of New York provided statewide direction for merit plans. The study report includes descriptions of specific career ladder approaches and merit recognition programs in place in community colleges. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

AWARDING FACULTY MERIT BASED ON HIGHER LEVEL NEEDS

ED266840

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. A. ANDREWS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

BY
DR. HANS A. ANDREWS
DEAN OF INSTRUCTION
ILLINOIS VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
OGLESBY, IL 61348

IC 860 134

WITH RESEARCH ASSISTANCE
FROM DR. WILLIAM MARZANO
DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL
SOLAR PRESS
NAPERVILLE, IL 60566

FORWARD

The title "Awarding Faculty Merit Based on Higher Level Needs" was chosen for a specific purpose. It stresses the need to recognize the accomplishments of faculty members which are of a superior quality. It also stresses the need of faculty to receive recognition, pay, master teacher status, etc. that goes beyond their basic survival needs.

The response from community colleges to the research survey was excellent and has allowed us to present the status of evolving merit plans in community and junior colleges as it exists in the mid-1980's.

Hans Andrews

William Marzano

SOME PRACTICES NATIONALLY IN COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

MERIT PAY PLANS HAVE NOT BEEN UNIVERSALLY IMPLEMENTED. The research available on such plans in elementary, secondary, and higher education levels is sparce.

There are a few well known elementary and secondary merit plans that are mentioned in almost every article that has tried to point to successful programs. Some of those most often mentioned are in the Ladue, Missouri School District; Washington Lake School District in Washington; Seiling, Oklahoma; the Houston Second Mile Plan in Houston, Texas; and the career ladder plan being implemented in Tennessee.

A NATIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDY

This writer and research colleague, Dr. William Marzano, decided to conduct a nation-wide survey of the merit pay practices in the American community college during 1984-1985. There had been little to no previous research conducted in this area and only a handful or articles had even approached the subject. In short, the researchers wished to find out what impact, if any, the national movement and

public pressure for merit pay had been having on the community college system.

Questionnaires were sent out to the 1300+ community, technical, and junior colleges that were members of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC).

A total of 816 colleges responded. This represented some 62.7% of the total colleges. Out of the 816 colleges, a total of 148 indicated yes to the question:

Question 1

"Does you institution currently have an operational FACULTY MERIT SYSTEM that provides FORMAL RECOGNITION and/or a MONETARY AWARD for outstanding faculty performance?"

Yes 148 No 653 Unanswered 15

The next most important question on the survey dealt with faculty evaluation plans.

Question 2

"Are both part-time and full-time instructors, including tenured faculty, subjected to regular, systematic evaluation?"

The following is the summary of the responses to the evaluation question:

Yes 700 No 111 Unanswered 5

The next question asked about the nature of evaluation utilized by each community college. There were eight choices listed. Those choices and the number of responses to each one can be seen on Exhibit 2.

Nature of Evaluation

1. 67 Primary emphasis on Classroom Observation and evaluation of teaching performance by college administrator(s).
2. 8 Primary emphasis on Peer Review process.
3. 71 Primary emphasis on Student Evaluation forms.
4. 13 Combination of Classroom Observation and Peer Review. Indicate which receives the greater emphasis:
   - A. 11 Classroom Observation
   - B. 2 Peer Review
5. 151 Combination of Classroom Observation and Student Evaluation forms. Indicate which receives the greater emphasis:
   - A. 98 Classroom Observation
   - B. 53 Student Evaluation
6. 42 Combination of Peer Review and Student Evaluation forms. Indicate which receives the greatest emphasis:
   - A. 22 Peer Review
   - B. 20 Student Evaluation
7. 116 Combination of Classroom Observation, Peer Review, and Student Evaluation forms. Indicate which receives the greatest emphasis:
   - A. 52 Classroom observation
   - B. 28 Peer Review
   - C. 36 Student Evaluation
8. 61 Other
9. 95 Unanswered

Only 24 of the 148 colleges indicated their merit pay or merit recognition system was contained in their faculty contract.

In relationship to negotiations a total of 339 colleges indicated there was a "presence of faculty collective bargaining (41%) while 425 said "no" (59%).

Ohio, Virginia, New York, Kentucky, and Illinois were the top five states. There were a total of 14 states with no community colleges having a merit pay plan in place.

The total of 148 colleges out of a total of 816 responses indicated a merit pay plan. This amounted to 18.1% of the total which is much higher than any figures previously compiled in elementary and secondary school districts.

Top States With Merit Pay Plans

States With Faculty Merit Plans	NR. of Merit Plans in State		Total NR. of Colleges That Responded By State
Ohio	15	of	29
Virginia	14	of	20
New York	13	of	36
Kentucky	11	of	14
Illinois	9	of	52
South Carolina	8	of	16
North Carolina	7	of	48
Oklahoma	5	of	13
Tennessee	6	of	12
Texas	5	of	46
New Mexico	5	of	11
Michigan	4	of	23

Others (Alphabetical)

Alabama	0	of	28	Mississippi	0	of	15
Arizona	0	of	12	Missouri	1	of	16
Arkansas	0	of	8	Montana	0	of	5
California	2	of	80	Nebraska	2	of	13
Colorado	1	of	16	Nevada	1	of	4
Connecticut	0	of	12	New Hampshire	0	of	4
Delaware	0	of	1	New Jersey	1	of	10
Florida	1	of	19	North Dakota	1	of	5
Georgia	4	of	11	Oregon	1	of	10
Hawaii	2	of	6	Pennsylvania	2	of	16
Idaho	2	of	2	South Dakota	0	of	2
Indiana	2	of	9	Utah	0	of	5
Iowa	1	of	18	Vermont	0	of	1
Kansas	3	of	16	Washington	1	of	22
Louisiana	0	of	4	West Virginia	2	of	6
Maine	0	of	5	Wisconsin	2	of	22
Maryland	2	of	12	Wyoming	0	of	5
Massachusetts	2	of	14	Other (Institution not indicated)	8	of	45
Minnesota	2	of	17				

SUMMARY

Public pressure for reforms in the nation's educational systems have sparked many states and individual school systems to look at merit pay or merit recognition. Developing a system that works, accomplishes appropriate institutional goals, and rewards the persons who qualify are all tricky aspects in initiating any system.

This chapter has summarized a national study of merit pay and merit recognition plans existent in the American Community College system in the mid - 1980's. The total of 18.1% of these colleges having some type of merit plan was well above the percentage expected to be found by Andrews and Marzano. Previous research showed no more than 4% of the elementary and secondary schools having a merit plan at any one time. Recent public pressure has undoubtedly raised this percentage also over the past few years. All school districts in states, such as Tennessee, will have such plans in place through the late 1980's.

The individual school plans presented point out the diversity in the plans that are evolving. A number of these are presented in summary form in the next chapter.

Faculty evaluation systems are present in the vast majority of the community colleges. Classroom observation mixed with some student evaluation was the number one evaluation system checked. Administrative classroom observation came in third place. It followed student evaluation which was the second most used evaluation plan by these colleges.

One surprise was the fact that only 8 colleges indicated "peer"

evaluation as being the primary evaluation system. This is one of the primary systems utilized by senior universities and one that is often suggested by faculty organizations.

The use of student evaluations has been proven to be almost useless in the elimination of poor and incompetent faculty. Students tend to create a strong "skew" to the positive side in their evaluations. In summary, poor instructors look more like average on student evaluation forms. Centra's (1979) research showed students to be very generous to faculty. It is unlikely that student evaluation will be able to provide much help in selecting "meritorious" faculty. The positive "skew" is more likely to create an image of the majority of faculty falling into this top range.

SPECIFIC MERIT PAY AND MERIT RECOGNITION PLANS IN AMERICAN COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

There is a definite movement by community colleges nationally to start recognizing the contributions of outstanding faculty. Many individual colleges are struggling to identify their own criteria and merit plan for such recognition. In some states the community colleges have some statewide direction. The Virginia Community College System (VCCS) and the State University of New York are two such systems. Both provide some guidelines to colleges within their system.

McMillan (1984) found only a handful of community colleges that awarded merit raises to faculty members. Some sample "merit" winners she found were:

(1) "An accounting professor at Howard Community College in Maryland recently developed a plan for using microcomputers in the accounting department. For that project, he received a raise of $805 and a bonus of $200.

(2) At Seward County Community College in Kansas, a social-science instructor received a performance rating of 3.6 -- out of a possible 4.0 -- after a lengthy evaluation of

his teaching and community-service activities. For his high rating, the instructor received $2,037 increase in his salary.

(3) Students and administrators at Mountain Empire Community College in Virginia gave an assistant professor of mathematics a 3.89 rating, on a 4.0 scale, for his teaching skills and other college contributions. Based on the evaluation, the professor received a $1,000 increase in his base salary" (p. 27).

The Virginia Community College System (VCCS) Policy Manual allows each college to develop a merit plan to best fit their own campus needs. Merit can be provided in at least three ways: (1) granting of a multiyear appointment; (2) granting of a promotion; (3) granting of a merit award salary increase. Merit awards are to be based upon performance evaluations. The VCCS states that no less than 15% of salary adjustment funds will be set aside for merit awards and possible bonuses.

The State University of New York specifies that "discretionary" salary increases for the full-time faculty should be no less than $500 and no greater than $3,000.

Several colleges have a career ladder approach. Seward County Community College in Kansas, Black Hawk College in Illinois, and Jefferson College in Missouri are three such colleges that have a career ladder. All three are described in this chapter.

Many of the colleges reported what may best be described as a "merit recognition" system of awarding extra pay or recognition to faculty. These type of systems were reported more often than career ladder systems.

CAREER LADDER APPROACHES TO MERIT PAY

The Seward County Community College, Kansas, "merit evaluation system" uses merit evaluation as the only criteria to be used for faculty salary increases. They point out that "it is more difficult to administer, and it implies continuous self-evaluation to which many people in higher education only give 'lip service'." The following are the five steps of merit salary increases:

1. *Step zero: Inadequate, needs considerable improvement;*
2. *Step one: Adequate, an asset to the college;*
3. *Step two: Good, valuable to the college;*
4. *Step three: Very good, approaching excellence; and*
5. *Step four: Outstanding, a credit to the entire profession.*

The following are the persons involved in administering Seward's merit evaluation system:

- *Student evaluation (students)*
- *Faculty self-evaluation*
- *Supervisory evaluation (chairperson, dean, president)*
- *Board (final approval only)*

The division chairpersons have the primary responsibility in this evaluation system. The following is a summary example on how merit salary increases are ascertained:

- *First, the president recommends to the Board a percentage (10%) of the total cost for teaching salaries for all full-time professors and persons who teach part-time but are employed by the college full-time ($1,000,000). Overloads and part-time instructors salaries are not included.*

- $1,000,000 X .10 = $100,000
  - $100,000 is available for faculty salary adjustments
  - With 40 full-time teaching faculty members and 124 total steps each instructor would receive an average merit step of 3.10.
  - 40 faculty members receive 124 cumulative merit steps: $100,000 - 124 = $806
  - Each merit step would be worth $806
  - An instructor who is awarded one merit step would get a salary increase of $806
  - An instructor who is awarded two merit steps would receive a salary increase of $1612
  - An instructor who is awarded three merit steps would receive a salary increase of $2418
  - An instructor who is awarded four merit steps would receive a salary increase of $3224

Seventy percent of the merit evaluation comes from instruction, teaching, and learning activities. The other 30% comes from student services, recruitment, and community service activities. The exact percentage that is generated from student evaluation, faculty self-evaluation, and supervisory evaluation was not clear in their Merit Evaluation Criteria and Procedure handbook. They do state that the "major purpose for the merit evaluation system is to assist in the improvement of instruction." What happens to the incompetent or poor instructors was not spelled out.

Barton Community College, Kansas, has the same system as Seward County Community College. They do, however, specify the following

weights to arriving at the final merit recommendations:

Administrative evaluation	50%
Job Targets	30%
Self Assessment	20%
Total	100%

The dean of instruction has the primary responsibility of evaluating the various professional staff in this system.

Black Hawk College in Moline, Illinois, has a "quality points" system for rewarding faculty academic rank in the following five categories:

A.	Professor	325 points
B.	Associate Professor	275 points
C.	Assistant Professor	225 points
D.	Instructor	175 points
E.	Assistant Instructor	140 points

These "quality points" are tied to college degrees held or subsequently earned, professional experience and study, professional licenses, etc. There appears to be some quality evaluation criteria tied to this promotional system. The quality points only meets the minimum requirements for promotion. Yearly evaluation of teaching and service to students and community are also included prior to a promotion. A total of 15% of the total campus faculty are the maximum that will be promoted each year.

Jefferson College in Hillsboro, Missouri, has developed a Professional Development System (1982) booklet to describe their "promotion system for rewarding outstanding faculty accomplishment in diverse professional areas." It is optional and provides an opportunity for persons who

desire promotions above their present level. It is based upon a number of years service (4 years in each grade) and gaining points in outstanding performance in a number of professional development areas.

The points are earned based upon the number of clock hours devoted to the activity:

Category 1. A maximum of 3/4 of the total points for promotion may be gained from this category. A minimum of 5/8 of the total points must be from this category.

AREAS

A. Curriculum and Instruction

B. Institutional Services

C. Lectures, Workshops, Short Courses

D. Course Work

E. In-Service Training

F. Work Experience

Category 2. A maximum of 3/8 of the total points for promotion may be gained from this category. A minimum of 1/4 of the total points for promotion must be earned from this category.

AREAS

G. Professional Organizations, Conferences

H. Publications

I. Creative Exhibitions, Performances

J. Related Civic Activities

K. Self-Instruction Programs

L. Travel

M. Grants

To be promoted from Level I to II, she/he must have completed four years' service; from Level II to III, eight years' service, and from Level III to IV, twelve years' service. Minimum point requirements are as follows: for promotion from Level I to II, she/he must earn a minimum of 240 points while in Level I; for promotion from Level III to IV, she/he must earn a minimum of 400 points while in Level III. These minimum requirements are summarized below.*

Promotion From:	Minimum Total Years of Service	Minimum Point Requirement
Level I to II	4	Earn 240 points while in Level I
Level II to III	8	Earn 240 points while in Level II
Level III to IV	12	Earn 400 points while in Level III

It is important to note that these are <u>minimum</u> requirements.

The Jefferson College system does not deal with classroom effectiveness because "effective classroom performance is considered basic to the retention and advancement of all instructors." Classroom evaluation precedes involvement in this professional development system.

"MERIT RECOGNITION" PROGRAMS

The following college merit programs best fit what is considered "merit recognition" programs. They usually provide for recognition for the past year of exemplary work, a cash award, plaque, and some form of public recognition. Some select the recipients through administrative evaluation procedures. Others use student, peer, and self-evaluating procedures.

The University of Minnesota Technical College in Waseca, Minnesota has a "merit adjustment" plan based substantially on a faculty self reporting system. In addition, faculty are to submit student, peer, and/or division director evaluations.

North Country Community College of Saranac Lake, New York, has a system of merit awards for 2 to 5 faculty each year. The merit amounts to $500 up to a high of $1,250 and is to be based upon "exceptional merit in their work for this college, and during this year, above and beyond the call of duty." They also have a George Hadson Merit Award for one or more persons each year. The criteria is based upon:

1. *Attitude toward work;*
2. *Consistency in job performance;*
3. *Versatility;*
4. *Personal responsibility;*
5. *Cooperation with fellow employees.*

Holyoke Community College in Massachusetts has set aside a percentage of 1.5% to 2.0% of the total salaries to go to performance based increases above the general pay increases handed out to staff.

The president of Moraine Valley submitted materials to describe their faculty recognition awards of Professor of the Year and Master Teacher. These awards are coordinated through their Center for Faculty and Program Excellence. These award winners are first formally recognized by the college and then they are submitted for a National Professor of the Year competition sponsored by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), Washington, D.C., and to the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development (NISOD) located at the University of Texas at Austin, Texas.

The pay for meritorious performance at Rogers State College in Oklahoma has as one of its major purposes to retain outstanding faculty. They use the merit pay to "meet or exceed the level of pay that the staff member could gain for the performance of a similar function at another location." Instructional evaluation accounts for 70% of the total evaluation. This includes student and self evaluations and <u>administrative intuitiveness</u> (emphasis added).

The Clermont General and Technical College in Batavia, Ohio, solicits self referrals from faculty members for "merit pay based upon superior performances." Selection is made based upon these self evaluations.

A merit salary program at Texas State Technical Institute tries to recognize employees "whose performance is consistently above that normally expected and required. It is intended to encourage continuation of a superior level of performance by the employee so rewarded and to encourage other employees to improve their own performance to equal or exceed that standard." Merit is budgeted for 25% of the total employees in this college.

The Virginia Community College System Policy Manual calls for the faculty salary plan for each college to include a merit pay component. A policies and procedures manual at mountain Empire Community College in Virginia calls for student and self-evaluation reports to support a faculty member. The supervisor prepares a narrative which describes subjective aspects of faculty evaluation. Whether this narrative is based on in-class evaluation was not clear in the manual.

Eastern New Mexico University awards up to 10% of their faculty no less than $1,000 non-renewing merit awards. Faculty members initiate the process by making application.

The Eastern Shore Community College plan in Melfa, Virginia, sets aside 15% of the next year's salary adjustment funds to make payments for their merit plan. Merit awards are tied to "performance evaluation." Performance evaluation scores for the various levels are as follows:

Descriptive Terms	Composite Scores
Excellent	4.50 + above
Very Good	3.75 - 4.49
Good	2.75 - 3.74
Fair	2.00 - 2.74
Unsatisfactory	1.00 - 1.99

The Virginia Community College System (VCCS) specifies merit award salaries are not to go to anyone evaluated as less than very good. John Tyler Community College, and Northern Virginia Community College submitted similar campus plans based upon the state*

---

* *This procedure is outlined under Item V., Virginia Community College System Compensation Plan.*

plan. Northern Virginia's campus plan lists the following criteria for job performance rating in Appendix J of their 1984 revised Faculty Handbook:

Criteria for Job Performance Rating

Excellent

The "Excellent" rating is reserved for the individual whose performance consistently exceeds the performance described under the rating category "Very Good" to the extent that special recognition is called for. This rating indicates outstanding contributions in classroom teaching, curriculum development, college activities, and professional development for a single year.

Very Good

The "Very Good" rating is given to the faculty member whose performance or responsibilities clearly exceed the "Good" level in most areas. This rating indicates very good performance of faculty responsibilities, including classroom teaching, curriculum development, college activities, and professional growth.

Good

The "Good" rating indicates satisfactory performance of all faculty responsibilities, including classroom teaching, curriculum development, college activities, and professional growth.

Fair

The "Fair" rating indicates the faculty member marginally meets performance standards of all faculty responsibilities.

Unsatisfactory

The "Unsatisfactory" rating indicates the individual fails to meet the minimal standards of performance expected of him as a faculty member at Northern Virginia Community College. The evaluator giving this rating must state specifically the basis therefore in item III (Required Narrative Justification for Rating) of the NVCC 105-84 form.

Philosophy, Rationale and Instructions

The five-category rating scale ("Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair", and "Unsatisfactory") is intended to define evaluation more clearly as a tool of improving job performance, and to protect the evaluatee from being dismissed for any reason other than failing to meet minimum job performance standards.

The evaluator will not give the rating of "Unsatisfactory" or "Fair" without having first given the individual written notice of his/her need for improvement. If a rating of "Unsatisfactory" or "Fair" is given, the evaluator must arrange a conference (or series of conferences) with the evaluatee for the purpose of establishing written job performance objectives, the fulfillment of which would raise his rating at least to "Good" during the following evaluation period."

A faculty award, the Burlington Northern Foundation Faculty Achievement Award, is available at Spokane Community College and

Spokane Falls Community College in Washington for up to 30 faculty candidates a year. These awards are based upon the following criteria:

> Student evaluations of actual teaching skills over a two-quarter period; the candidate's self-evaluation and evaluation by a peer and a supervisor; letters of endorsement from current and former students; resume and other supporting documents; and finally, oral presentations by nominating students.

Student nominations and student evaluations appear to weigh heavily in this faculty award program.

Lake Michigan College in Benton Harbor Michigan has a board of trustees goal to:

> "Develop and maintain employee morale; develop and implement a recognition program for staff. This would include a $1,00 merit award and a certificate of recognition to five college employees annually." (Browe, 1984, p. 2).

The president's merit awards to go no more than five persons a year and are based on (1) excellent job performance; (2) enhancement of LMC image; (3) service to the college; (4) involvement in the community; (5) scholarly activity and/or professional growth; (6) positive attitude toward LMC and his/her job; (7) long-term service (3 or more years).

Illinois Valley Community College, Oglesby, Illinois has a faculty and staff "merit recognition" procedure. Awards of $500 and an inscribed plaque for excellence in classroom instruction and other job related activities (which vary by individual). Nominations are made by administrative supervisors. Faculty are nominated by division

chairpersons, the associate dean of instruction, dean of instruction, and/or the college president. Illinois Valley has an administrative evaluation system that evaluates all tentured as well as non-tenured faculty. Faculty recommendations for merit recognition come primarily out of the in-class evaluation system and also include extraordinary other efforts by these faculty members. Some 25 faculty have been recognized during the honor banquet for students over the 6 year period the system had been in operation. The system is refined each year. The college also gives public recognition through board of trustee approval at a board meeting and through public information releases. The program is based on the premise of the need for persons to receive recognition other than in basic pay programs. It is also the college's way to give recognition of the talent it has available in its classroom. The same administrative evaluation system is used that has effectively led to the dismissal, resignation, or early retirement of a number of tenured faculty at the other end of the "curve."

Another administratively oriented merit plan is in effect at the College of Southern Idaho. They concluded as a result of a professional standards committee review that:

(a) Merit is an administrative proclamation and should be determined by the administration.

(b) Merit, by its' nature is very subjective and, therefore, cannot be quantified. We all realize how difficult it is to quantify a subjective test like an essay and be uniform.

(c) It was the feeling of everyone on the committee that the philosophy of merit is commendable. If merit is inevitable, it was felt that the Dean should be responsible for its

determination. If he does his homework, he should be the most non-biased and best informed person to do it. His system should be given full support of the faculty.

(d) Merit should be based only on one year's performance.

Clark Technical college in Springfield, Ohio, awards $1,000 monetary amounts to approximately 5 persons a year. They are recognized at the colleges' Charter Day ceremonies. The president of the Agricultural and Technical college in Alfred, New York, assigns discretionary funds for salaries to those identified as above average in their performance. They can go to as many as 205 of the staff. The discretionary fund plan is derived out of the Office of the Chancellor of the State University of New York system guidelines.

The Distinguished Faculty Member Award at Walters State Community College in Morristown, Tennessee recognizes one outstanding faculty member each year at the annual Honors Day program of the college. The person is recommended to the president from an awards committee appointed by the president. The faculty member's classroom teaching effectiveness is the primary consideration used.

ON FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Lewis and Doyno (1983) in doing a review on faculty reward structure in The American university system ran across an unpublished report by (Kaun, 1979) which outlined "how academic merit salary increases are justified or attained." Among the findings were the following:

1. There was no significant relationship between either teaching effort or, for the most part, teaching quality and rates of advancement.

2. The foremost factor in advancement was years of service.

3. An almost equal influence was years since the Ph.D.

4. Because of a decreasing rate of advancement as one moves up in the ranks, the coefficient for experience was negative.

5. Publication of refereed journal articles also turned out to be an important explanatory variable, while other writing played a more minor part, as did administrative service.

In their own analysis of academic merit, Lewis and Doyno conducted a quantitative and qualitative analysis of 417 recommendations (letters) for merit awards at one American university. They hoped to find how the faculty and administrators "define merit." They paid particular attention to how the academic characteristics of a writer or recipient affect the type of case made. They also analyzed the "relative weight given teaching, research, and service" in the letters they reviewed (p. 707). They concluded:

> "In this study of letters nominating candidates for merit salary increases, there is considerable evidence that teaching is less valued than administrative service or research. One finding of particular interest was the gap in the size of merit salary increase recommended between those involved in administrative activities and those who seemed to keep their distance from these pursuits. Institutional service may not quite be a sine qua non for success, but it is a significant factor in the definition of academic merit" (p. 718).

This section of the book is, by no means, an attempt to outline or describe the many complex programs of merit pay that exist in American colleges and universities. It was only added to this book to show two fairly recent pieces of research that sheds some light on the complex variables that exist in such pay programs.

The public outcry for educational reforms has been fairly well limited to the elementary and secondary schools to date. The four-year colleges and universities, however, get quickly dragged into the outcry when the call for screening and preparation of quality teachers surfaced how poorly selected and prepared too many new teachers entering the field have become. More recent research is also starting to challenge the quality of college preparation in the 1980's.

SUMMARY

Community College merit pay plans fall under two major categories: (1) career ladder, and (2) merit recognition. This follows the same national trend as secondary schools.

A study of the many plans that were submitted to Andrews and Marzano in their national study showed many colleges were in the early developmental stages for such merit plans.

Most of the plans received had considerable use of student, peer, and self reporting elements. These same colleges had little to no in-class evaluation by administrators involved in their procedures. One must question the strength of such programs in terms of accountability when supervisory personnel have such little percentage of input into such systems.

The College of Southern Idaho and Illinois Valley Community College presented two models which are primarily administratively administered and determined. The Illinois Valley system arrives at potential merit recognition awardees through its in-class administrative evaluation system. The College of Southern Idaho found merit to be "an administrative proclamation and should be determined by the administration." They wanted their instructional dean to play the major role in determining merit winners. They felt he would be the most overall objective person in a rather subjective process.

Student, peer, and self reporting systems have been evaluated in the research to have little value because of the positive skew in reporting or low correlation (peer). Relegating of merit determination to these systems will make them suspect. Administrators will also have to prove themselves competent if they are to become, as this writer believes they should, the major source for determining merit awardees in the future.

Merit pay and merit recognition program that are not tied to strong faculty evaluation systems will carry very little credibility with the general public and legislators. Colleges, secondary, and elementary schools can do much in the years ahead to tie both merit, for the most competent faculty, and dismissal, for the least competent faculty, to credible administrative evaluation system. If not, legislation as has taken place in Illinois, will mandate such a program for the schools!

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
APR 24 1986